

### REMARKS

Claims 1-12 and 19-21 are presented for further examination. Claims 1 and 11 have been amended. Claims 13-18 have been canceled.

In the Office Action mailed July 24, 2006, the Examiner rejected claims 1-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, because the phrase “any object” was not supported. Applicant has deleted the word “any” from claims 1 and 11.

Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 10-15, and 17-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Craig (of record) in view of Mardirossian (of record). Claim 16 was rejected as obvious over Craig in view of Mardirossian and further in view of Nelson (of record). Claim 4 was rejected as obvious over Craig in view of Mardirossian and further in view of Manion (of record). Claims 8-9 were found to be allowable and claims 20-21 were allowed.

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the bases for the rejections and requests reconsideration and further examination of the claims.

In a telephone conference with the Examiner on October 23 and again October 24, 2006, applicant discussed the fact that Craig does not teach disabling of the autopilot or overriding and bypassing the autopilot. Rather, Craig only taught disabling the inputs to the autopilot as set forth at column 7, lines 17-19 and column 12, lines 34-38. In addition, Craig specifically teaches only disabling the inputs to the autopilot in claim 32, which depends from Craig’s claim 31.

The present specification clearly discloses the anti-crash system 20 overriding the autopilot as well as the auto-controlling and piloting system 40 bypassing and overriding the autopilot as set forth at page 10, lines 1-8 and 18-23 of the Substitute Specification previously submitted. Moreover, the specification clearly shows that each of these system (the anti-crash system 20 and auto-controlling and piloting system 40) have the ability to control the flight systems, landing gear, flaps, etc. In view of the foregoing discussion, the Examiner agreed that claims 1-12 and 19-21 would be allowable if the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112 was cured. In view of applicant’s deletion of “any” from claims 1 and 11, applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-12 and 19-21 are now allowable.

Claims 13-18 have been cancelled. Applicant reserves the right to pursue these claims by continuation or divisional application.

Applicant is submitting herewith a new Substitute Specification that corrects additional informalities. These include spelling and punctuation errors and formatting changes. No new matter has been added. Applicant respectfully requests approval and entry of the Substitute Specification.

In view of the foregoing, applicant respectfully submits all of the claims remaining in this application are now clearly in condition for allowance. In the event the Examiner finds minor informalities that can be resolved by telephone conference, the Examiner is urged to contact applicant's undersigned representative by telephone at (206) 622-4900 in order to expeditiously resolve prosecution of this application. Consequently, early and favorable action allowing these claims and passing this case to issuance is respectfully solicited.

The Director is authorized to charge any additional fees due by way of this Amendment, or credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 19-1090.

Respectfully submitted,  
SEED Intellectual Property Law Group PLLC

/E. Russell Tarleton/  
E. Russell Tarleton  
Registration No. 31,800

ERT:jk

Enclosures:

Substitute Specification  
Redlined Substitute Specification

701 Fifth Avenue, Suite 6300  
Seattle, Washington 98104-7092  
Phone: (206) 622-4900  
Fax: (206) 682-6031